

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,990	08/27/2003	Murty Mangena		6744
Dr. Murty Man	7590 04/02/200 gena	EXAMINER		
518 Codell Dri	ve	FUBARA, BLESSING M		
Lexington, KY	40509		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/649,990	MANGENA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BLESSING M. FUBARA	1618	

	BLESSING M. FUBARA	1618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ii	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sest forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 March 2008</u>. A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.				
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		oadoc				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo							
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-3 <b>2</b> 4).				
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-8,10-18 and 20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
<ul><li>12.   Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13.   Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>03/03/08</u>	3					
/Michael G. Hartley/							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that only the selection of the conditions recited in amended claims 1 and 17 would lead one to arrive at the product, but it is noted that the pH recited is a range and falls within physiological pH and it is further noted that Later teaches two different viscosities of PLGA. Regarding applicant's argument that there is no motivation to pick buprenorphine free base from the long list of possible actives, it is noted that any of the drugs can be formulated according to the process of Lawter with buprenorphine specifically named and the list is finite such that such that the use of buprenorphine in the contemplated compositions has reasonable expectation of success using PLGA's having the viscosities taught in the examples. While Lawter did not teach the mixture of PLGA having the different viscosities, Lawter teaches the use of PLGA's with different viscosities so that a combination of PLGA's with the active agent would have reasonable expectation of success. Regarding applicant's argument that Oshlack does not overcome the deficiency of Lawter, it is noted that Oshlack is relied upon for formulating buprenorphine with polyvinyl alcohol and not for teaching the use of PLGA with the buprenorphine. Applicant appears to have different reasons why Oshlack is combinable with Lawter while the office action combines the specific teachings of Oshlack, that is, PVA with buprenorphine with buprenorphine and PLGA. Similarly the Hill reference is relied upon for teaching buprenorphine formulation that contains PVA and that is the reason for combining Lawter with Hille to arrive at a composition that contains buprenorphine, PLGA's having the different viscosities and PVA. Furthermore, regarding the pH, it is noted that Lawter's release medium is at 7.4 (column 6, lines 62 and 63) and pH of between about 6.8 to about 8 and spans the pH of physiological milieu and is within the technical skill of the artisan to formulate buprenorphine at a pH within acceptable pH for buprenorphine.

The examiner acknowledges receipt of IDS filed 03/03/08. Applicant's statement of the substance of the interview is substantially correct.

/BF/